

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,630	06/27/2003	Per Martinsson	930010-2206	8456
20999 FROMMER L	7590 07/21/200 AWRENCE & HAUG	EXAMINER		
745 FIFTH AV	ENUE- 10TH FL.		PIZIALI, ANDREW T	
NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/608,630	MARTINSSON ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Andrew T. Piziali	1794		

	Andrew I. Fiziali	1794						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.							
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to 	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (a) above, if checket. Any reply re-ceived by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to They raise new issues that would require further cor 			cause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below								
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reject	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmen	t canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an ex	planation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,14,15,17,28 and 48</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>5,7-12,19,21-26 a</u> .	nd 29-47.							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing- entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
	/Andrew T Piziali/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1794						
	. Illiary Examiner, Art o							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

The applicant asserts that Fleischer does not teach or suggest coating the monofilament before the monofilament is used in the papermaking fabric. The applicant asserts that the fabric is coated, rather than each monofilament. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Fleischer clearly illustrates the monofilaments as being individually coated with a sheath of resin material. See Figure 7 wherein the resin sheath (18) coats the yarn (16). In addition, Fleischer specifically states that the yarns (16) have been coated with the resin (18) (column 4, lines 22-36).

The applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine the references. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Fleischer does not appear to specifically disclose that the layers of the resin sheath are visibly distinguishable from one another and the core by contrasting color or reflectivity, but Fleischer does disclose that the yams are subject to abrasion and wear (column, I, line 41 through column 2, line 50). Parsey and Lamb each disclose that it is known in the abrasion and wear yarn at that a core may be surrounded by a plurality of outer layers of different colors to indicate the degree of wear (see entire documents including column 2, lines 8-29 of Parsey and column 4, lines 2-3-3 of Lamb), It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention wande to make the multilayer resin sheath of the monofilament of Fleischer with a plurality of outer resin layers of different colors from one another and the core, motivated by a desire to allow for the indication of the degree of wear.